

Date: Sat, 8 May 93 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #133
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 8 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 133

Today's Topics:

 MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
 What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 07 May 1993 13:55:18 -0500
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!news.oc.com!
utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ricksys!lawton!red.uucp!terry@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <1s79cg\$mq\$@gaia.ucsf.edu>, John Stanley writes:
>In article <1993May04.145600.112514@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H.
Myers) writes:

>>If you are saying "I'll meet you on 2P1" in an effort to obscure any meaning
>>of the communication, that is contrary to 97.113(d).

>

>If you are operating a MARS station you are not subject to part 97, you
>are subject to MARS rules. If those rules take you into the amateur
>frequencies, it doesn't matter. Government radio location services, when
>present in the amateur bands, are also not bound by part 97. Neither
>are the international broadcasters in zones II and III who transmit in
>the 40m band.

>

>>How can it be simpler?

>

>Yes, how can it?

>

Its really a function of by what authority you are operating. If the station transmitting the "2P1" was signing with a amateur radio call sign then part 97 does apply. Regards, Terry.

--

DOMAIN: terry%red@lawton.lonestar.org (Terrence R. Redding)

UUCP: . . . !rwsys!lawton!red!terry (Terrence R. Redding)

PACKET: WB5LMJ @ WB5MJS.OK.USA.NA

Voice 405 536-8822, Ben's Place (Benjamin Franklin) BBS 536-6988 9p to 6a

PhD candidate, University of Oklahoma in Adult and Higher Education

Educational Advisor, American Radio Relay League

221 SW Crystal Hills Drive, Lawton, Oklahoma 73505

Date: Sat, 8 May 1993 08:00:27 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well.... now that you bring it up what if we kept the exam multiple choice but only publish the questions. People can study them and be sure they receive an appropriate exam and teh can't memorize 3A-14 is A. Or whatever. Of course the block diagrams can be fill in the blanks and let the examinees view their exams after grading so they have some form of immediate response if they don't like the grading on the fill in the blanks. As you said a with a general fill in the blanks format it would be too difficult to assure objectivity. It would be nice to have a certain amount of continuity in the code portion of the exam too. Some of the VE's locally are known to have really easy multi\|tiple choice exams for the code protion and others are known for being hard. (Sunnyvale=easy and River City ARC=hard) As others have said the misdirecters on the tech part of the exam can be really obvious sometimes. I think the number answers that are just off by misplaced decimals are the most fair. They don't require all the tedious math but they do require one to know what range of values to expect.

IMNSHO

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
```

* I do not speak for the University of California.... *
* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

Date: 6 May 93 23:53:14 EST
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!wariat.org!nraven!
raven@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <raven.02pj@nraven.wariat.org>, <1993May5.185630.20695@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1sbntuINNqdn@topaz.bds.com>
Subject : Re: Autopatch

RE: autopatch conversation..

Looks like I started a bit of a heated topic.. =)

Okay, well, thanks to everyone for all of the comments and such, I think I've
figured out what the rule is and how it applies to the situation.. perhaps it
wouldn't be illegal, but the group that runs the repeater may become irate if
the autopatch is used..

raven@nraven.wariat.org
Dan Roberts (N8XXW)

Raven's Nest Inn 216/468-3890

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #133
